

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/036,914	MOLLENKOPF ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DARYL C POPE	2632	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DARYL C POPE.

(3) MEL BARNES.

(2) VINCENT ROCCIA.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 April 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 42.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: THE EXAMINER LEFT A VOICE MAIL MESSAGE WITH APPLICANT'S REPRESENTATIVE VINCENT ROCCIA PERTAINING TO THE DEPENDENCY OF CLAIM 42 ON CANCELED CLAIM 36, AND INFORMED MR. ROCCIA TO LEAVE A VOICE MAIL MESSAGE INDICATING THE CORRECT DEPENDENCY OF CLAIM 42. MR. BARNES, ON BEHALF OF MR. ROCCIA, IN A VOICE MAIL MESSAGE INFORMED THE EXAMINER THAT CLAIM 42 WOULD BE DEPENDENT ON CLAIM 31 .